



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/788,979

02/27/2004

Wolfgang Aderhold

008304

6862

60300

7590

08/17/2010

LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES GUENZER

ATTN: APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.

2211 PARK BOULEVARD

P.O. BOX 60729

PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER

PAIK, SANG YEOP

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3742

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/17/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte WOLFGANG ADERHOLD, SUNDAR RAMAMURTHY, and
AARON HUNTER

Appeal 2009-003417
Application 10/788,979
Technology Center 3700

Before JOHN C. KERINS, STEVEN D.A. McCARTHY, and
MICHAEL W. O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ERRATUM

The June 28, 2010 decision to the above captioned appeal omitted identifying claim 8 as being reversed under the “OPINION” heading on page 4, the “CONCLUSIONS” heading on page 7, and the “DECISION” heading on page 8.

The original decision has been corrected to read –

On page 4: “The Examiner has failed to meet the initial burden of setting forth a basis for the obviousness rejection of claims 1-5, 7-9, 30, and 31. These claims are directed to methods of thermally processing a substrate in a reactor. The Examiner’s obviousness rejection fails to point out where Ballance, Anderson, Moslehi ’499, and Moslehi ’538 describe each limitation of claims 1-5, 7-9, 30, and 31. Ans., *passim*. Moreover, the Examiner’s rejection fails to cogently explain how the disclosed structure within the combined teachings of Ballance, Anderson, Moslehi ’499, and Moslehi ’538 would perform the claimed steps within claims 1-5, 7-9, 30, and 31. Thus, the Examiner has failed to meet the initial burden requisite for a conclusion of obviousness for the claimed subject matter within claims 1-5, 7-9, 30, and 31.”

On page 7: “The Examiner has failed to meet the burden requisite for a conclusion of obviousness for the claimed subject matter within claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-15, and 30-32.”

On page 8: “The Examiner’s decision to reject claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-15, and 30-32 is reversed.”

All other portions of the June 28, 2010 decision remain unchanged. Any timelines prescribed by the original June 28, 2010 decision remain unchanged. If there are any questions pertaining to this erratum, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

mls

Appeal 2009-003417
Application 10/788,979

LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES GUENZER
ATTN: APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.
2211 PARK BOULEVARD
P.O. BOX 60729
PALO ALTO, CA 94306